l: Allen H-4 (no date) 1932 RI1 Georgia RI1



121 periods. I have, however, included in the bibliographical sections a list of works in Russian and Georgian, which may be of assistance to the student who would proceed further in this field. It is indeed a field which merits exploration, and a student with the requisite qualifications and the necessary leisure should supplement, in the Caucasus, the great work of critical research which Ellis Minns and Rostovtseff have already accomplished for South Russia and the Crimea.

I have also dealt only in the most cursory way with the political history of the Iberian and Albanian Kingdoms during the first six centuries A.D. I have passed thus over this period, because to approach it at all adequately would have necessitated much specialized research. The history of these Kingdoms, and also of the relations of the Roman and Persian Empires in the Caucasus, is a subject which itself calls for prolonged and fundamental study.

In regard to the transliteration of Georgian and other foreign names and words, I have to offer my excuses to the stickler in these matters. I have been engaged in writing this book over a period of nine years, in various places and under varying conditions, and at different times I have come under the influence of different schools of thought in the matter of transliteration. At one moment I went to some expense in engaging the services of a specialist to systematize the spelling of all names in the book on the most approved recent method. Unfortunately, this gentleman, before he could complete the work, accepted an academic appointment abroad, and I found it impracticable to adopt his ideas without his personal
121 assistance. I have therefore attempted, at the last moment,
● 104 to systematize the spelling, particularly of Georgian names, on a phonetic basis, which I hope will prove comprehensible to the English reader. In the case of Georgian proper names, the laws of euphony in the Georgian language provide that all proper names terminate in a vowel. Where that vowel is an -i, the -i is dropped before a qualifying noun or ordinal numeral, thus :—King Wakhtangi = *Mépé Wakhtangi*, but Wakhtang the King = *Wakhtang Mépé*: Wakhtang the Georgian Lion = *Wakhtang Gurgaslani ;* King David = *Mépé Daviti*, but David II = *Davit Méoré*, David the Restorer = *Davit Aghmashenebeli*. I have followed this rule in transliterating Georgian names into English, as it seems to me to suit the peculiar euphony of the Georgian language, even when the names are read in an English context. In the case of a few

l: Allen H-4 (no date) 1932 R11 Georgia R11



names, such as Giorgi and Dmitri, this rule does not apply—for obvious reasons of euphony.

In the case of certain names, such as David, Alexander and Constantine, I have, for no particular reason, adopted the English form—I think generally because it happens to be more pleasing to the eye. There is, of course, a precedent to follow in this matter, as, for instance, the use in English books of the Russian *Ivan* for John, but of Peter and Paul instead of *Petr* and *Pavl*. In regard to Georgian place-names I have always used the Georgian form in preference to the Russianized form—e.g. Kákheti and not Kakhetia (which should, if anything, be Kakhia), Kartli and not Kartalinia. Exception has been made in the case of completely Latinized forms such as Tiflis for Tpilisi, Kutais for Kutaisi, Mingrelia for Samégrélo, Somkheti for Somkhiti. I have also used the Georgian words *mta* (mountain), *tba* (lake) and *tsqali* (river), both in the text and in the maps, in preference to the later Turkish *dagh*, *göl*, and *su* or *chai*.

There are, I suppose, few authors who would not like to rewrite their books, as there can be few men who would not appreciate the opportunity of re-living their lives. I recognize that this book is in certain respects disjointed. This fact arises from the circumstances under which it has been put together. There are a few passages which tend to be repetitive. The treatment of the subject, which is—of intent—horizontal rather than chronological is responsible for this fault, and the obscurity of the subject has induced me to risk, here and there, a certain repetition, in order to attempt greater clarity of exposition.

I am indebted to many friends and to many institutions for their kindness, toleration and help. I shall not, indeed, attempt to mention all those to whom I have placed myself under obligation during the last nine years. I am indebted to the authorities and institutions of the Georgian S.S.R. for many courtesies and favours during my stay in Georgia. In particular I should mention the officials of Tiflis University and of the Centralni Arkhiv Department. I am also indebted to the Turkish authorities for facilities, not usually accorded, during my stay in the eastern vilayets, and I have to record my gratitude for the long and generous hospitality of H.B.M. Consul at Trebizond, Mr. W. D. W. Matthews, and of Ihsan Bey Nemli-zadé, a resident of that city.

To the Biblioteca Communale of Palermo I am indebted for permission to photograph and use a number of Castelli's

l: Allen H-4 (no date) 1932 RI1 Georgia RI1

[Ancient Georgia]

## FROM THE CLAN TO THE CLASS

In the Greek text Cassius uses the word *protos*; now *protos*, which means literally "the first", "the illustrious", is rendered by the Georgian translators of the Greek by the word *aznauri*.[1] It was *aznaurni* then who composed the suite of Farsman II. The word *aznauri*, of which *aznaurni* is the plural form, comes from the Perso-Armenian root *azn* formed with the suffix *ur* = *ver*, that is *azna-uri* = *azna-veri*, wherein *azn*, according to Prof. Marr, denotes birth, origin, descent, and *ur* = *ver* = son.[2] *Aznauri* thus means "son of birth"—in other words, "son of illustrious birth or origin". The Georgian equivalent of *aznauri* is *gvarishvili* = son of *gvari*; also *gvarovani* or *gvariani*, of illustrious *gvari* or clan. The *Protoi Iberôn* of Cassius and the *aznaurni* or *gvarianni*, *gvarishvilni*, of the Georgians all have then one and the same meaning, the only difference between the two Georgian words *aznauri* and *gvariani* being in this, that the first is formed from a foreign and the second from a purely Georgian root.

If *aznauri* denoted the person or the rank of persons, of high, illustrious birth, there can be no doubt that there must have been some denomination of the persons or rank of persons of lower, less illustrious birth. We can find no indication of this in Dio Cassius' work, since he makes reference only to the *aznaurni* in Farsman's suite. There are no Georgian sources for the same period. But in later Georgian monuments, the earliest of which belongs to the fifth century, namely, *The Martyrdom of St. Shushaniki the Queen*, we are provided with valuable retrospective light; in it we find that the population of Georgia was divided in the fifth century into *aznaurni* and *uaznoni*.[3]

*Uazno*, of which *uaznoni* is the plural form, is the negative form of *aznauri* and consequently means of non-illustrious or of low birth, literally birthless, without birth. The *uaznoni* or *ugvaroni*, that is the people who were without *gvari*, who did not belong to a *gvari*, were of no consequence at all, since they possessed no *gvari* to uphold them. An *aznauri* or *gvariani*, a *gvarishvili*, on the contrary, because he belonged to a *gvari* could feel himself assured of his personal independence. The social state is, as Professor Javakhishvili has correctly observed, "perfectly reflected" in the term itself used to designate the "members of privileged *gvarni*"—in the word

[1] Translation of St. Mark's Gospel, VI, 21. That *protoi* must designate *aznaurni* was first suggested by the Georgian Professor Javakhishvili; see his *Gosudarstvennie stroi drevnisi Gruzii i drevnisi Armenii* (Spb. 1905).

[2] N. Marr, *Tek. Raz. A-G*, Book IV.

[3] Cf. J. M. Sabinini, *Sakartvelos Sametkhi* (*The Paradise of Georgia*), Spb. 1882, p. 191.

4: Gugushvili E-4.5 (no date) 1935 RI1 Georgia RI1



this alphabet. It is hoped that the fount can be procured, however, 212
and that the sacerdotal alphabet can be reproduced in some future number of this journal.[1]

The Georgian alphabet consists of forty letters of which the 39th and 40th, namely, ფ, ღ, were introduced into new Georgian in the eighteenth century, the former to represent the Latin or Russian f, and the latter to represent an undefined sound in Georgian which, though formerly unheeded, was recognized by Anton I, Catholicos of Georgia, the writer among other works of an extensive Grammar of the Georgian language. Neither of these two letters, however, have gained stability in modern Georgian which uses the letter პ' to represent the sound of f. The letter ღ has been included in the Alphabet in this journal for the reason that, occurring as it does in the Svanian, Megrelian (Mingrelian) and Chanian languages of the Georgian linguistic family, it is thought that it may be of use in the transcription of words of these languages containing this sound. For the same reason an additional sound, which occurs in Megrelian and is represented by ქ̣, has been explained in the paragraph on the Pronunciation of the Georgian Letters.

Modern Georgian uses only thirty-three of the forty letters given in the Table, the seven letters now obsolete being: ეჳ or ჱ, ყ, ჷ, ჯ, ჴ, ფ, ღ.

## Transliteration of the Georgian Letters

While Georgian collaborators of *Georgica* have expressed their 104
preference for the late Professor Marr's system of transliteration, English collaborators and advisers find it inacceptable for reasons with which Georgians are unable to agree. The advantage of Marr's system lies in the transcription of the affricates, whereby an affricate is indicated by a letter representing the stronger element of the sounds making up the affricate in question, and a diacritic indicating the participation of the weaker element in the engendering of that affricate. The same diacritics (˙ ˭ ˗ ˆ) are always the indicators of the participation of the spirants (*ḫ*, *q̇*, *ẏ*, etc.) in the engendering of the guttural, and of the sibilants in the engendering of the dental or palato-dental affricates (cf. page 134).

Such a truly analytical transcription, reflecting as it does the nature of the composition of the affricates, should be of great help to students. Especially strong was the objection shown to Marr's ϑ//θ Of course we could have replaced this ϑ//θ by t', and have done so,

[1] For an idea of the shape of the letters of this alphabet see the photographic reproduction of a Georgian inscription, p. 68, which contains twenty-five of the thirty-seven letters of the alphabet.

# THE GEORGIAN ALPHABET

212
104

| | Name | Ancient Military | Transliterations used by | | | | | | Ancient Greek Values | Proposed Scientific Transliteration | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Miss | Mahn | Dodgson | Dirr | Weakley | Bennett (French) | | Academy | Popular |
| 1 | ა | ა | a | a | a | a | a | a | 1 | a | a |
| 2 | ბ | ბ | b | b | b | b | b | b | 2 | b | b |
| 3 | გ | გ | g | g | g | g | g | g | 3 | g | g |
| 4 | დ | დ | d | d | d | d | d | d | 4 | d | d |
| 5 | ე | ე | e | e | e | e | e | e | 5 | e | e |
| 6 | ვ | ვ | v | v | v | v | v | v, w | 6 | v | v |
| 7 | ზ | ზ | z | z | z | z | z | z | 7 | z | z |
| 8 | ჱ | ჱ | ey, ē | ē, ey | ē | ee, h | | ē | 8 | ē | ey |
| 9 | თ | თ | th/// | t' | t' | t' | t'h, th | th | 9 | t' | t' |
| 10 | ი | ი | i | i | i | i | i | i | 10 | i | i |
| 11 | კ | კ | k | k | k | k | c | c, k, c' | 20 | k | k |
| 12 | ლ | ლ | l | l | l | l | l | l' | 30 | l | l |
| 13 | მ | მ | m | m | m | m | m | m | 40 | m | m |
| 14 | ნ | ნ | n | n | n | ,n | n | n | 50 | n | n |
| 15 | ჲ | ჲ | y | y | y | ie | | ie | 60 | y | y |
| 16 | ო | ო | o | o | o | o | o | o | 70 | o | o |
| 17 | პ | პ | p | p | p | p | p | p | 80 | p | p |
| 18 | ჟ | ჟ | j (ž) | ž | ž | ž | sh | j | 90 | ž | sh |
| 19 | რ | რ | r | r | r | r | r | r | 100 | r | r |
| 20 | ს | ს | s (š) | s | s | s | s | s | 200 | s | s |

212
104

| | Name | Modern letter | Transliteration used by | | | | | | Numerical value | Proposed Unicode Notation | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Klaproth | Hübschmann | Dorn-Brosset | Erckert | Wardrop | Bennett (French) | | Academy (1937) | Papuashvili |
| 21 | ტარო | ტ | t | t | t | t | t | t | 300 | t | t |
| 22 | ჳი | ჳ | w | ü, w | w | vie, vi | | viĕ | 400 | w | w |
| 23 | ფარ | ფ | u | u | u | u | u | ou | | u | u |
| 24 | ფარო | ფ | ṗ | p' | p' | p' | p'h, ph | ph | 500 | p' | p' |
| 25 | ქარო | ქ | q | k' | k' | k' | k | k | 600 | k' | k' |
| 26 | ღარო | ღ | ġ | ɣ | ɣ | ɣ | gh | gh | 700 | ġ | gh |
| 27 | ყარო | ყ | k̇ | q | q | q | q | q | 800 | q | q |
| 28 | შინ | შ | m (÷) | š | š | š | sh | ch | 900 | š | sh |
| 29 | ჩინ | ჩ | ϕ/// | č | č | tš | ch | tch | 1,000 | č | ch |
| 30 | ცარო | ც | ϕ/// | ẹ | ẹ | ts | ts | ts | 2,000 | ts | ts |
| 31 | ძილი | ძ | ḋ | dz | j | dz | dz | dz | 3,000 | dz | dz |
| 32 | წილი | წ | ṫ | c' | c | dz | 'ts | ts | 4,000 | ts' | dz |
| 33 | ჭარო | ჭ | ṫ | č' | č | dž | dch | dch | 5,000 | ẹ | dz |
| 34 | ხარ | ხ | q | x | x | h | kh | kh | 6,000 | x | kh |
| 35 | ჯარო | ჯ | q | x | x | ḫh | khh | h' | 7,000 | x | kh |
| 36 | ჰარ | ჰ | ḋ | j | j | dž | dj, j | dj | 8,000 | j | j |
| 37 | ჰე | ჰ | h (÷) | h | h | h | h | h | 9,000 | h | h |
| 38 | ჰო | ჰ | oy (ü) | ō | | h, oe | ho | hoe | 10,000 | ō | hō |
| 39 | | ◆ | f | | | f | | f | | f | f |
| 40 | | ◆ | • | | | | | | | • | • |

104 but we have not thought it wise to follow this up in the case of affricates containing the sound of t' as it would have entailed the use of two diacritics. For instance, the sound represented by us as ծ and by Marr as ʒ would have to have been represented by ṭ', that is, by two diacritical marks, the dot below the symbol indicating the participation of the sibilant š (ʒ < ʒ + š, or, as we have it, ծ < t' + š). Likewise the sound represented by our ligature ც would be ḳ' (Marr's ʠ). The use of two diacritics in the representation of one sound might not in itself have been objectionable had it not been for the fact that the substitution of Marr's ʒ by t', and the ḳ' or ṭ' consequently resulting therefrom, complicated matters somewhat when we came to the sounds ც' and ʒ, which Marr represents as ḳ and ṭ respectively. We should thus have had five t's, namely, t', ḳ', ṭ', ḳ, ṭ, which, apart from orthographical confusion, would have been bewildering, to say the least.

So Marr's transcription had to be either adopted or rejected in its entirety. The latter step was chosen, temporarily at least, our idea being to submit the question of transliteration for the consideration of experts who, perchance, may read this journal and, it is hoped, may interest themselves in this question. Partly for this reason and partly because the articles printed in the present number had already been prepared, the transliteration proposed by us (see the Table of the Alphabet), which we call rather incorrectly "analytical", has not been used in the present number.

As soon as a proper analytical transliteration is worked out, or, failing this, the adoption of Marr's transcription is decided upon with the concurrence of all those interested in the question, *Georgica* will be glad to remedy the anomaly of the transliteration in its present number.

To facilitate the task for those who may interest themselves in the question, we have given side-by-side in the Table, by way of information, the systems of transliterations used by some prominent writers, past and present, on the Georgian language.

It should be pointed out that, in our opinion, the diacritical mark, as in t', p', k', etc., is not quite a voluntary and happy choice on our part, for in phonetic science generally this sign has come to denote an aspirated pronunication of the letter to which it is attached. Since in Georgian the sounds denoted by t', p', k', etc., are not aspirated *t*, *p*, *k*, etc., respectively (see page 134), the anomaly of the use of this diacritical mark is too obvious.

While on this subject of transliteration, we consider it our duty to acknowledge gratefully the very helpful advice and suggestions given on this question by H. W. Bailey, M.A., D.Ph., the Hon. Secretary of our Society, and by R. T. Butlin, B.A., a member of the Society's Council, both of the School of Oriental Studies. Our thanks are